

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 5, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-15 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein; and claims 16-22 have been added. Accordingly, claims 16-22 are all the claims now pending in the present application. No new matter has been introduced by the new claims added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application, the Applicants have provided amendments to the specification, abstract and Fig. 11. The changes to the specification and the abstract include minor editorial and clarifying changes. Additionally, the change to Fig. 11 includes adding a "Prior Art" legend to the figure. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the specification, the abstract and Fig. 11.

In Office Action, claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 1 recites a "camera shake detection unit/correcting unit" without reference to a camera. Claims 1-10 have been canceled thereby rendering the above rejection to those claims moot. Additionally, the issues noted above by the Examiner have been addressed in the new claims. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiyooki (Japanese Patent No. 2002/328428, hereafter "Kiyooki"); claims 2, 3, and 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,603, hereafter "Shimada"); and claims 11, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Pate (U.S. Patent No. 7,187,343, hereafter "Pate").

Additionally, claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Shimada, and further in view of Sonoda et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0050932, hereafter "Sonoda"); claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Shimada, and further in view of Pate; claim 12 has been

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Pate, and further in view of Shimada; and claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyooki in view of Pate, and further in view of Sonoda.

The Applicants have canceled claims 1-15 thereby rendering the above rejections to the above claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) moot. Additionally, the Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features noted above in independent claim 16.

Independent claim 16 recites the following features:

“[a] video projector for projecting video, comprising:

a projection optical system which projects video by short-wavelength laser light sources which emit laser lights as linear polarized lights of at least three colors of red, blue and green; and

a camera device which captures external light through the projection optical system, wherein said projection optical system projects the three-color laser lights without losses in their light amounts using prisms performing polarization, which are arranged such that the respective axes thereof coincide with the polarizations of the three-color laser lights, and a part of the captured external light is incident on the camera device by the prisms performing polarization.”

The features noted above in independent claim 16 are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure.

The present invention (as recited in independent claim 16) is distinguishable over the cited prior art in that the video projector according to the present invention includes linear-polarized short-wavelength laser light sources employed as light sources, and a prism having a polarization that is to be located on the optical path of the light source lights. Therefore, it is possible to utilize the amount of light from the light sources with no loss at all when projecting video.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the combination of Kiyooki, Shimada, Sonoda and Pate for rejecting the claims of the present application. However, the Applicants assert that none of the cited prior art discloses or suggests the features of at least new independent claim 16.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies primarily on Shimada for disclosing or suggesting the use of short-wave laser light sources; and Pate for disclosing or suggesting the use of a prism. Specifically, the Examiner states that Kiyooki does not teach the use of short-wave light sources (see Office Action, pg. 3) and Kiyooki in view of Shimada does not teach the projection optical system which has a prism having polarization (see Office Action, pg. 9).

However, the Applicants assert that Shimada and Pate fail to disclose or suggest a video projector that includes a linear-polarized short-wavelength laser light sources employed as light sources; or a prism having a polarization that is to be located on the optical path of the light source lights, as recited in independent claim 16.

In the present invention (as recited in independent claim 16) a projection optical system projects the three-color laser lights without losses in their light amounts using the prisms performing polarization, which are arranged such that the respective axes thereof coincide with the polarizations of the three-color laser lights, and a part of the captured external light is incident on the camera device by the prisms performing polarization.

Although Shimada discloses a lights short-wavelength laser light sources and Pate discloses a prism having a polarization, the references are silent with regard to at least the following features of independent claim 16:

- 1) a projection optical system that projects three-color laser lights without losses in their light amounts using prisms performing polarization, which are arranged such that the respective axes thereof coincide with the polarizations of the three-color laser lights, and a part of the captured external light is incident on the camera device by the prisms performing polarization.

Moreover, Kiyooki and Sonoda fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Shimada and Pate such that even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Kiyooki, Shimada, Pate and Sonoda, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 16.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Kiyooki, Shimada, Pate and Sonoda would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claim 16. Likewise, no combination

of Kiyooki, Shimada, Pate and Sonoda would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 17-22 at least by virtue of their dependencies (directly or indirectly) from independent claim 16.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhisa YAMAMOTO et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2009.06.03 16:23:43 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 3, 2009